

health care for senior citizens. We're fighting to stop that.

Connectivity which we see in our economy. Between government regulations, excessive taxation, and having too many people in Washington who have never gotten dirt under their fingernails, they've never met a payroll, they've never created a job, they've never worked in the private sector. That's the disconnect between here and at home. We have people right now that are gathering around their kitchen tables. They are looking at the resources that they have coming in and know that they can't spend more than they take in. Tomorrow morning those small businesses are going to unlock the doors. They know that they have to spend within the limitations of the income that they have.

Forty-nine of our States live under a balanced budget requirement, just like the men and women who live in the communities of those States. Isn't it about time, isn't it about time that Washington applied the same principles that they expect out of every American, every American family, to apply to Washington, D.C.? Some will say "no." But that's a challenge—more importantly, that is the opportunity that we truly face right now in this country. We have an opportunity to change the course of American history for the better, to embrace, once again, the values that truly made this country the freest, the richest, and the greatest nation on the face of the Earth, and that the Earth will truly ever see. American entrepreneurship, American know-how, but we have to have the freedom, the resources, and the opportunity to do that. The government is no longer the steppingstone to success in this country but has, indeed, become a stumbling block.

□ 2010

This is our chance. This is our opportunity. We have many votes here, had a vote today.

This is not the end of the debate, but it is the beginning of a solution. If we embrace that opportunity, that special and unique thing that it is to truly be an American, American exceptionalism, and allow Americans to do what they do best, to innovate, to create and to build, we will be able to get this country back on the right course, but it will not come as long as we continue to build government, protect programs, and forget about the people who sent us to Washington.

Let's stand up once again for the American people, for the small business people who truly make America work and are the number one job creators in our country.

Mr. WEST. I thank my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, we know that not all regulations are bad, but so many of them are obstacles to job creation. A recent study by the Heritage Foundation found that an unprecedented 43 major regulations were imposed in fis-

cal year 2010 with a total economic cost of \$26.5 billion, the highest total since at least 1981.

The cost of regulations is a big obstacle for American job creators. But when you think about regulations, here are examples of some of the ones that can make you laugh.

The Department of Energy requires microwave makers to measure the amount of energy their products use in the "off" position.

The Environmental Protection Agency wants stricter regulations on the amount of dust on American farms.

The Department of the Interior wants to impose a fee on Christmas tree sales to promote Christmas tree sales.

When you think about how government regulations destroy American jobs, these are the statistics that will make you cry. According to a Louisiana State University professor, the Department of the Interior's de facto moratorium of exploration in the Gulf of Mexico could cost 36,137 jobs. In addition, more than 80,000 jobs could be lost due to the EPA regulations targeting the cement industry; and, finally, EPA greenhouse gas regulations could cost \$1.4 million jobs.

The American people placed an upper limit on the damage that Washington Democrats could inflict on the economy by firing House Democrats in the last election.

In January, we began to implement the Pledge to America, which is focused on providing an environment for economic growth and job creation. We voted to repeal the government takeover of health care, roll back costly Obama administration regulations, cut job-destroying spending and change the culture of Washington, D.C., from one which talks about how much more they can spend, to one which now talks about how much we can cut in spending.

The United States Congress in 2009 passed the President's almost \$800 billion stimulus package, which we now have convincing proof it did nothing to reduce unemployment. Today the House of Representatives has sent nine real-life job creating bills to the U.S. Senate, yet those bills continue to sit, waiting to be voted on, similar to the Cut, Cap, and Balance that we sent over that the Senate majority leader tabled.

I have introduced my own piece of legislation to do my part to try to reduce unemployment, The Small Business Encouragement Act, H.R. 1663.

The President continues with an economic policy based on job-killing over-regulation, the specter of increased taxes and the implementation of ObamaCare. How many more months are we going to see this stagnant job growth? We are now at 29 months of unemployment in the United States of America being at or above 9 percent.

The President has to realize his policies have failed. They have failed the American people, and it is time to go

in a different direction. The solution lies in economic taxation and regulatory policies which incentivize long-term private sector growth. We must restore confidence, provide access to capital which will create economic certainty. Now is not the time for more rhetoric on spending, borrowing, and raising taxes. Our country is in a crisis, and time is running out.

We must remember that it is those same mom and pop stores on Main Street back in our respective districts that create the jobs for our teenagers during these summer months. It is the local hair salon back home that my wife and my two daughters visit often that would be affected by the uncertainty that persists throughout this Nation.

Economic uncertainty created by our massive Federal debt, burdensome regulatory environment on small businesses, and uncertain tax policy for 2012 is slowing commerce; and we must turn the corner. Today's somber GDP announcement in the last quarter of 1.3 percent growth and the previous quarter, 0.5 percent growth, is further proof that President Obama's administration's economic strategy is not working.

Unemployment still remains above 9 percent, at 9.2 percent nationally; in the inner city and our black communities is at 16.2 percent; and, unfortunately, for our veterans, of which I am one, that unemployment rate is 13 percent.

We just talked about our quarterly GDP growth. That is unacceptable for the most powerful economy in the world. Providing certainty for America's small businesses should be the number one priority for Washington, considering they are the backbone of our Nation's workforce and the engine of our economy.

In May, House Republicans put forth a plan for America's job creators. That includes commonsense policies to remove uncertainty by reducing regulatory burdens, lowering business tax rates to 25 percent, spurring exports by quickly passing the pending free trade agreements, and introducing a budget that gets our Nation's fiscal house in order. The sooner we enact policies like these into law, the sooner our small businesses will be able to lead us out of this economic downturn.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2020

SENATE SHENANIGANS ON DEBT LIMIT BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 5, 2011, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. It's been quite an eventful day here on the House floor, a lot of scurrying, a lot of things going

on in committee rooms, different meeting rooms around the Capitol today. And actually, last night, when I finished talking and meeting with folks around midnight or so, it appeared that Republicans would start today with basically not much change to the bill we had yesterday.

But we had a conference this morning, the Republican Members of Congress, and added to the Boehner bill was the requirement that before the President would get the full tranche of the debt ceiling being lifted there had to be a balanced budget amendment passed from the House—with two-thirds vote, of course—and from the Senate with two-thirds vote and be sent to the States by the Archivist of the Capitol for their ratification.

Now, it's a shame that a balanced budget amendment is needed, but if there could have been a piece of legislation that were prepared and passed that were tight enough to require always that a balanced approach be taken—no more money spent than money coming in—then we wouldn't have had to worry about a balanced budget amendment. But what we've seen over the last 100 years or so in this country has been runaway spending. And I think of the line Jim Carey had in one of his movies, "Somebody stop me," and Congress needed somebody to stop Congress. But the only way to do that, constitutionally and legally, was to change the Constitution so that Congress could be stopped from spending more money than it took in.

I was going to vote "no" on the Boehner bill as of yesterday, as of last night, but this morning, I found out that the Speaker, as he said he would, had listened to the Conference and put back in the balanced budget amendment requirement. It already had a requirement in there that there would be a vote, but we knew that the Senate had already voted 51 votes to table the balanced budget amendment. They didn't even want to debate it. And now tonight, as I speak, the Senate has wasted no time, with the Majority Leader of the Senate, a Democratic Party leader—I would bet that he has not bothered to read the bill, that he has not bothered to see what's there, and perhaps Majority Leader REID does not know that 70 percent or so of all American adults would like to see a balanced budget amendment passed.

Tonight, again, he is working against the will of the American people, just like he and then-Speaker PELOSI did in pushing for ObamaCare to be passed though a majority of Americans did not want that kind of government intrusion into their lives. Well, Democrats still control the Senate, so once again they're working their private will against the will of the American people.

So as I speak, I don't know what the tally is. It was being taken as I walked onto the floor. But I would imagine that Leader REID would not have brought the Boehner bill, with the re-

quirement of having a balanced budget amendment passed by two-thirds, to the floor of the Senate unless he knew, once again, he had the 51 Democratic Senators who were willing to vote to table the bill that has required so much sweat—I don't know that there were any tears, but there was a lot of sweat and a lot of frustration. I know I've had plenty, anger at times, frustration. But we came together and got the bill done. And I ended up being a "yes" for a number of reasons, but the most important was that the balanced budget amendment was going to be required to pass two-thirds of the House and Senate before the President got the debt ceiling increase that he so desperately wants.

To table that—it's bad enough that the Senate all this time has been trashing things that we've been fighting for and getting accomplished in the House, but to table it? You're not even going to let Republicans who want to speak on this issue come to the floor of the Senate and have a fair debate simply because one party controls the majority? You want to keep the other side from coming to the Senate floor and having a fair debate over a balanced budget amendment. It is just staggering to think that, once again, just like when ObamaCare was crammed down the throats of Americans, not with any sugar, it was a sour piece of medicine, and now, not even to allow debate over a balanced budget amendment to be brought to the Senate floor, I don't think the Founders intended that. I don't think the Founders intended that when 70 percent or so of Americans felt something was critical for the ongoing and good of the country, that you would have one group in either House who would prohibit even discussing, debating a bill, using the rules and 51 Senators to prevent debate. I mean, that's one of the things that helped make this country great.

This was the one place you used to be able to say whatever you wanted. It has been credited to different people, "I disagree with what you say, but I'll defend to the death your right to say it," and now it appears the Senate is operating under the rule, "I disagree with what you say, so I am going to use procedural maneuvers and prevent you from saying what you want to say."

And I'll say this about Speaker JOHN BOEHNER, too. He knows that I have not been happy with many of the things that have gone on, but unlike the Majority Leader in the Senate, he has made no effort to prevent me from coming to the House floor and speaking my mind, such as it is, here on this floor. We're supposed to have freedom of speech, but the Senate will not allow the working of the people's will on the Senate floor.

Now, I've heard some people say, Mr. Speaker, that the fact is that by our passing this bill today in the House that we have provided a vehicle for the Senate to use to completely strip out and put some contorted piece of legis-

lation on and send back down here. Well, the fact is that the Senate did not need this bill today to have a vehicle to send a contorted piece of legislation back to us. Now, the Constitution makes clear, anything that produces revenue has to originate in the House. That's the Constitution. But it is also important for people to understand, Mr. Speaker, the lengths to which the rules have been twisted—and I think misused—in order to make something happen that never should have.

A good example is this monstrosity some call ObamaCare. It's got different names, but the original name of this bill was H.R. 3590, and it calls it: the Bill from the House of Representatives.

So this was a Senate bill—ObamaCare was a Senate bill, started in the Senate, derived in the Senate. Well, then, since the Democrats raised revenue in ObamaCare, created new taxes, introduced taxes, well, that's a revenue-generating bill, then how in the world could the Senate originate the bill since it generated revenue, because the Constitution makes very clear they can't do that.

□ 2030

Well, what the Senate did was take H.R. 3590 entitled, "an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first time home buyer's credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes." That's ObamaCare.

And I would humbly submit that any bill that starts as a lie, because this bill was a lie, a bill that starts as a lie can't be a very good bill in the end.

We know that any building that has a proper foundation can weather a lot of storms. This bill has a lie for a foundation. The ObamaCare bill, H.R. 3590, "an act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first time home buyer's credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces." And they had to do double page, and this paper is very, very thin so they could get all of this stuff in here.

But it is interesting. You know, the bill started as a bill to help veterans and our military. But this bill, to help veterans and our military, those who are putting their lives at risk for our liberty, for our benefit, that was stripped out and this ObamaCare bill begins with page 1, line 1 of the bill to help our veterans and military, and strikes every single word, deleting every single word in the bill to help veterans and our military, and substitutes therefore ObamaCare.

That bill started as a lie. They took a bill that had nothing to do with health care, and they stripped every word that would help our military and made it ObamaCare. That is phenomenal, just incredible.

So the Senate didn't need us to pass a bill today for them to do the same thing, to take some well-intentioned bill, some bill that did some great things for America, deleting beginning

on line 1, page 1, and substituting therefore whatever contorted mess that the Senate is going to send down here.

But the thing is, although some of the Senate leadership has been taking their shots in the media at the House, they have not passed anything. They have fought now today makes twice as the Nation moves toward not having enough money while the House has been embroiled in serious debate and discussions trying to put together a bill. And we did that, and it had 234 votes. And the Senate immediately tabled it.

The truth is, I thought we should wait for the Senate to do anything. And I disagreed with the Speaker's strategy. The Speaker's strategy was if they won't take that, then let's try again. We will compromise on the things that we want and send a bill that is clearly a compromise of the things that we want, so surely the Senate will take it up and surely they will pass it.

We heard from Majority Leader REID that he was going to make sure that it was dead on arrival, but those kinds of things have been threatened before, too. We know that the President has drawn many lines in the sand that have kept moving. And we have heard the President talk about his bill. I can recall sitting back there during the September speech by the President in here on health care in which he kept talking about his bill, my bill, this bill, and don't misrepresent my bill or I'll call you out. And he was the first one to use the lie word here on the House floor talking about what he believed to be misrepresentations of his bills.

I asked the HHS Secretary a couple of weeks after that, the President keeps talking about my bill, this bill, where can I get a copy of the President's bill? And Secretary Sebelius said: I think he was talking about a set of principles.

So I was right. The President talked about this bill, my bill, this bill, my bill, but he had no bill. People talk about how beautiful his clothes were, but the fact was the emperor was naked. There was no bill. There was no bill then; and now as the President talks about his bill, his ideas, there is no bill. As HARRY REID talks about his bill, there is no bill. Maybe they will finally get around to passing something. There is something filed in the Senate, and as I understand it, Chairman DREIER has filed it down here so that we can take it up. We will see what happens.

But the phenomenal thing is how badly off track this Congress has gotten when one of the Houses, in this case the Senate, will not even allow debate over something that the vast majority of Americans want. Forget Democrat, forget Republican, forget red, forget blue. Let's get responsible.

Mr. Speaker, there is \$160 billion in deficit spending. My second year here, 2006, was not responsible; and Demo-

crats won the majority as the result because they promised we will eliminate that \$160 billion deficit spending. Man, oh, man, were they right. They eliminated \$160 billion in deficit spending. And now this year as a result of their actions, the last four, we will have \$1.6 trillion in spending deficit this year. Bringing in around \$2.2 trillion.

We find out today the numbers from the first quarter of this year, which was very little growth at all in our economy which people got depressed about when the original numbers came out, was about a third of what they originally thought it was. Things aren't looking good. This is President Obama; it's his economy. With the changes that Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader REID made in the first 2 years of this President's tenure, they set us on a track that is leading to a major crash.

Now, we have already heard in recent days that the August 2 deadline that the President set, just like I said some weeks back, that was not a particularly special day. It did happen to be the day before the President's big birthday celebration, but otherwise it was not a particularly significant day. I know that the group that Tom Daschle helped start, the Bipartisan Policy Center, whatever it is, that they were echoing whatever the President said, that August 2 was going to be the day.

And they lumped in Social Security with everything else. The law is very clear, Social Security gets paid. It is on automatic pilot. Just like in 1985 and just like in 1996, when there was a shortfall 1 month, the Treasury Secretary is supposed to sell off some of the Treasury notes. There is \$2.6 trillion in Treasury notes, sell off enough to pay the benefits and expenses of Social Security. So there is no risk of that failing.

We also know there are many times more than enough money to pay our debts as they come due in August; and so we have been told, well, actually it is not August 2. Maybe it is like a couple of weeks or a couple of weeks beyond that. We are not sure, but sometime in the future. Well, in the House it has been taken seriously even though August 2 was not particularly a magic date. We have passed two bills, and the Senate has passed zero. That's irresponsible. Absolutely irresponsible. That invokes no confidence that this government will ever be able to do what it needs to.

So I know, I have gotten emails, calls, and letters. Members of Congress all over the floor on both sides of the aisle have gotten calls and letters and emails. The majority in my office have encouraged me to stand firm. It is great to represent a district that understands not to cave in to fear-mongering.

□ 2040

It has been rough in recent days because you never like to be chided by

friends who don't like the position you're taking on a bill. But I'm ever so grateful that the bill was made eminently better this morning by adding the requirement that the Balanced Budget Act pass. And not only that, talking through the day, I do appreciate Speaker BOEHNER face-to-face, eye-to-eye. He has been very gracious all week. It's others that have made it kind of tough at times. He realized something needed to be done. He wants to do something. So, in talking with him and also talking with Chairman PAUL RYAN, the chairman of the Budget Committee, I'm also satisfied that we've got a number of wonderful things coming.

We can perhaps figure at some point the Senate will get concerned about going against the will of the majority of the Senate. At some point they're going to realize: We should not keep going against 70 percent of the American public because a lot of us have got elections next year. So, gee, maybe we better do something that the majority of Americans want.

Well, one of the things that I heard Rush Limbaugh talking about in the nineties when Congress was not even a blip on my radar was the zero baseline budget. And it didn't make any sense to me as he explained it. I thought, that's strange. As it was explained, we have automatic increases in every agency's budget in the Federal Government. Every agency has automatic increases every year. Well, citizens don't get automatic COLAs but their agencies sure get an automatic increase every year. All those budgets, they get automatic increases. Why? We ought to have a zero baseline budget every year so nobody gets an automatic increase in the government agencies. If they want an increase, they ought to have to come in and prove it. And we can save trillions of dollars if we just required every budget in the Federal Government to start out and prove what they need for the year. A zero baseline budget. No automatic increases.

Well, when I got to Congress and was sworn in in January of 2005 and started looking at the things that would make America stronger, a zero baseline budget made sense. During that Congress I filed a bill to require a zero baseline budget. No automatic increases every year. And then back in those days it didn't make sense the Republicans wouldn't bring that to the floor because any time you slowed the automatic increase as a Congress, there were people that called you a draconian fool, you're making draconian cuts, when you weren't making cuts, you were just slowing the rate of growth. It wasn't a cut. The only way to fix that was just say: No automatic increases.

And I pushed for that in my first Congress in 2005 and 2006, and Republicans were in the majority. And our leadership at that time, particularly in 2006, when I talked with some of our

leadership then, and I was pushing it, and I was told we just can't do that. We should have. We didn't. We should have had major tax reform. Well, now is the time. This is a great time to push for a flat tax or a simplified tax that's fair, simpler, and so that everybody has their fair share.

I don't want a mega-rich person paying a 10 or 12 percent income tax. Everybody ought to have some interest financially in what happens here—and not because they make lots of money and don't put anything in. People need to have a vested interest in this Congress by paying income tax in. And the lowest rate is down, I believe, around 15 percent. It may be 5 percent. I've forgotten now. But the top rate has been 39 percent. Some people want it to go higher. And even though the top rate is 39 percent, there are some mega-rich that don't pay 39. Well, why not have a tax that's a fair tax cut across the middle that will be a flat tax. Everybody pays the same amount of tax. That ought to be fair. Everybody ought to have the same thing.

Art Laffer, a great economist that helped revive the dismal economy coming out of the Carter administration, was just saying this week—I agreed with what he said. I have been talking about this, and I appreciate that man's opinion so much. He said we ought to have a flat tax. And he said, I believe you could get there and have the same amount of revenue if you were to have a 12, 13 percent flat tax, and even allow for mortgage interest deduction and to allow for deductions to charitable contributions. That was the main part of the tax. There was another aspect. But, boy, that would be so much more fairer. No mega-rich would get out without paying nothing. GE shouldn't have to pay nothing or, get away with paying nothing just because they're a friend of the administration and get lobbying and all that kind of stuff.

Everybody ought to have to pay something. I'm okay with reducing corporation tax because when you do that, you're reducing the tariff we're putting on our own products. And if you took off the 35 percent tariff we put on every corporate American good produced, there's no telling how many markets around the world would just be begging for American products that would have 35 percent less of a tariff on those goods. We could compete anywhere if we keep the tariff down on our own goods. People talk about putting tariffs on other people's goods. We ought to get it off our own. And then you would see massive amounts of economic boom going on, and people would be hired, and more people would pay the 12, 13 percent income tax. You would have more revenue than ever coming into the American coffers in the Federal Government. That would create jobs. And as people know, the best form of welfare is a job. You feel good about yourself. But it's hard to feel too good about what is going on down there.

As I have said before, down in the Senate, above the door from the Presi-

dent's sitting position, above the left door are the words "Annuity Coeptis." He, God, has smiled on our undertaking. It's part of our Great Seal on the back of every dollar bill. It's hard to believe that God could be smiling on people that will not allow debate on a responsible balanced budget amendment.

In the time I have left, let me just say we've got so many calls, emails, letters, encouragement. And so many of them say, We're praying for you in Washington that you will do the right thing. Some of us happen to believe—and I won't try to push my religious beliefs on others—but some of us happen to believe that as we're told in the Old Testament, the Lord is the source of all wisdom. That there is no wisdom outside of that. Ben Franklin apparently believed that, as he said in 1787, "I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth: that God governs in the affairs of men."

Mr. Speaker, Peter Marshall was Senate Chaplain back in the 1940s, and a constituent gave me this book with many of the prayers that he prayed there on the Senate floor. I want to finish, Mr. Speaker, with a prayer prayed by Peter Marshall, U.S. Chaplain for the United States Senate in the 1940s. On the Senate floor, as the Senators are down there. It makes a wonderful prayer.

Peter Marshall prayed:

"We pray to Thee, O Christ, to keep us under the spell of immortality."

"May we never again think and act as if Thou wert dead. Let us more and more come to know Thee as a living Lord who hath promised to them that believe: 'Because I live, ye shall live also.'"

"Help us to remember that we are praying to the Conqueror of Death, that we may longer be afraid nor be dismayed by the world's problems and threats, since Thou hast overcome the world."

"In Thy strong name we ask for Thy living presence and Thy victorious power. Amen."

Mr. Speaker, may that be our prayer also tonight.

I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, July 30, 2011, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2650. A letter from the Deputy Director, Food and Community Resources, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the De-

partment's final rule — Competitive and Noncompetitive Nonformula Federal Assistance Programs — Administrative Provisions for Biomass Research and Development Initiative (0524-AA61) received June 20, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2651. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2652. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8187] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2653. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket ID: FEMA-2011-0002] received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2654. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Prompt Corrective Action; Amended Definition of Low-Risk Assets (RIN: 3133-AD81) received July 11, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2655. A letter from the Assistant Deputy Secretary for Innovation and Improvement, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Promise Neighborhoods Program (RIN: 1855-ZA07) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2656. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Interim Enforcement Policy for Certain Fire Protection Issues [NRC-2008-0486] (RIN: 3150-AG48) received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2657. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Federal Employees Health Benefits Program: New Premium Rating Method for Most Community Rated Plans (RIN: 3206-AM39) received July 14, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2658. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Marking Meteorological Evaluation Towers [Docket No.: FAA 2010-1326] received July 7, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2659. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. Model 205A, 205A-1, 205B, 212, 412, 412CF, and 412EP Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0561; Directorate Identifier 2010-SW-001-AD; Amendment 39-16715; AD 2011-12-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 12, 2011, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2660. A letter from the Senior Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Model CL-600-2C10 (Regional Jet Series 700, 701, & 702), Model CL-600-2D15 (Regional Jet